FY 05 PROMOTION BOARD INFO

FY 05 PROMOTION BOARD INFO

It is an officer's responsibility to maintain their record and was expected by the boards. It was a mark of professionalism. An incomplete or difficult to read record negatively affected some officers.

Failure to complete the required PME for your grade detracts from your record. All boards viewed PME completion as the norm and failing to complete PME made a record less competitive.

Being out of shape and/or not meeting height weight standards is a detractor. If you are above the normal height/weight, you need to look exceptional in the photograph and score a high first class PFT to remain highly competitive.

FY 05 PROMOTION BOARD INFO

Having a Masters Degree is not a significant component of a record.

Prolonged periods out of the operating forces were a detractor.

Some records that failed selection had been through previous screening processes. That an officer had been through a screening process such as HMX or SEP and was successful did not necessarily mean that officer would be competitive for promotion.

Letters are most effective when short and bring more detail to an issue, and are written by current or former commanders. Often, the higher the rank of the officer writing the letter the more effect it had. In some cases, letters can decrease the competitiveness of a record.

FY 05 COL'S BOARD

Previous command time was a heavily weighted issue in making a record competitive.

Resident TLS was not a heavily weighted issue but did add value to the record. There were more Col selects that had not attended TLS than those that had. Officers who were selected for command, but had no observed fitreps were less likely to be selected than those with observed reports in command.

Recent operational time was critical.

Eligible	Selected	% selected
AZ 228	4	1.8
IZ 228	115	50.4
BZ 225	0	0

Selection Opportunity: 52.2%

FY 05 LTCOL'S BOARD

Credibility in MOS was very heavily weighted. Diversity, being a MAGTF Officer, is important but not as weighted as MOS credibility.

Relative value (RV) was heavily used as a performance indicator as were RO markings.

In aviation MOSs, AMO, OPS O, and XO were the most heavily weighted billets.

The majority of the board's focus was on Majors time. There were two key items from earlier in the record: previous command time, and value and distribution. H&S Command time did not typically have the same weight as line Company/Battery Command time.

Back to back, three-year tours out of the MOS and operating forces were very detrimental. Specifically SEP, MOJ, Flight

FY 05 LTCOL'S BOARD

Letters that addressed minor concerns at the ranks of Lieutenant or Captain may have attracted attention to elements of the record that might not otherwise have been considered by the board.

Marginally competitive records were less likely to be selected if they were deep in the lineal.

Several back-to-back tours in non-deploying units made a record less competitive.

Page five of the fitness report was the portion of the report that got the majority of the board's attention. Section I was very important and needed to be written well. RO comments are very heavily weighted.

Broken time was a detractor, particularly if it caused an officer to miss key billets.

FY 05 LTCOL'S BOARD

When the RV and RO marks do not match the comments (word picture); the board most often favored the RV and RO marks.

Eligible	Selected	% selected
AZ 461	31	8.2
IZ 377	233	61.8
BZ 468	0	0

Selection Opportunity: 70%

FY 05 MAJ’S BOARD

Letters were beneficial when they made an issue more clear. It was best if the letter brought a missing piece of the picture to the officer's record. If you have had a problem, take responsibility for it. Letters that restated billet accomplishments did not carry much weight.

Not completing PME was a significant detractor to the competitiveness of a record. There were a few cases where officers were not complete and were selected, but this was not the norm.

Officers that were above-zone and finished previously incomplete PME generally enjoyed success in selection, but only if they had continued superior performance.

TBS class standing was considered by the board.

Missing items, (administrative correctness of the record), could

FY 05 MAJ’S BOARD

	Eligible	Selected	% selected
AZ 89	30	4.8	
IZ 627	534	85.2	
BZ 655	0	0	

Selection Opportunity: 90%

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REPORTING SENIORS

Reporting Seniors need to keep track of their marks to make RV an accurate tool.

Reviewing Officers need to track their marks and be consistent to make the evaluation effective.

It is very important for word pictures and numeric pictures to match for a report to carry the most validity.

The fleet needs continuing education in how to track their marks when writing fitness reports.

Reports written by civilians need to be reviewed for their compliance and accuracy. Senior Marines need to mentor civilians in report writing to help them accurately record performance.

JA SPECIFIC RECOMENDATIONS

The JA community needs to do a better job WRT Fitness reports. Any edge that we may have had under the old system due to superior writing skills has been minimized by the new numbers driven system.

Other than the job title and a quick go/no go check of the PFT score on P.1, w/ rare exceptions, page 5 of the fitrep is the only one that receives any significant attention. All should be reminded that the actual blocks checked on pages 2-4 do not matter, what really matters is how a report stacks up against other reports written by the RS/RO on Marines of a similar grade. In each case, that comparison is clearly calibrated for the board to see, and that comparison is a primary element in the OQR record analysis process.

In this regard, our RSs and ROs need to understand how the new Fit Reps are living documents and how their value is effected by past and previous reports. In order for a report to

JA SPECIFIC RECOMENDATIONS

Does that mean reports by new RSs/ROs have less value? Yes. However, while that may seem unfair on the front end, we should remember that the impact value of the report (good or bad) will increase over time if the RS/RO stays in the system as an RS/RO. We should work to have RSs/ROs w/ "numbers credibility" writing on folks at critical junctures of their careers.

If MRO is the only Marine the RS/RO has done, they should definitely give thought to leaving some room for improvement or decline on subsequent reports on that guy or the next guy, or the guy after that. The first report will be both the best and worst report written regardless if it is all Cs or all Es. The ROs need to know that the value of the report floats like the stock market based on the nature of subsequent reports on MRO or other Marines of that grade. They must, must, must keep track of what marks they have given out and make a decision every time about how they want to effect the value of past reports. RSs and ROs should be repeatedly reminded that MM will send

JA SPECIFIC RECOMENDATIONS

A number of other communities do a better job WRT demonstrating a sense of progression w/in a series of Fit Reps over the course of a two or three year tour. Very typically Marines in the aviation community will show improving numbers over the course of a three year period. In this manner of grading, the RSs/ROs use the early fitreps to improve the standing of the later reports. Normally the briefer noted that the early report was lower because it was a "welcome aboard", and then gave the MRO credit for having blossomed and moved over to the right. In some fashion this may be a transparently calculated accounting scam on the part of the RSs/ROs, but the MROs benefited from this more than from a situation where everyone was lumped together. The lumping together of folks by Rel. Value numbers and R/O Christmas tree ratings was a somewhat common phenomenon w/in the JA Fit Reps. We have to do a better job of splitting our folks into, at a minimum, upper and lower half performers. It would be even better if the RSs/ROs could develop three clear tiers of performers. In that manner the good folks will be clearly IDed. Remember, in order

JA SPECIFIC RECOMENDATIONS

The job title on JA fiteps is very important. An effort should be made to make it meaningful, not simply "action officer", "staff counsel", "third jerk from left". If a person cannot be cast as something very understandable like a DepSJA, they should be given a descriptive title that speaks to the type of law they have been doing. For majors, every effort should be made to title them as the head of something. The recent O5 board valued breadth of experience. They like to see a progression where a person worked in military justice, legal assistance, operational law, civil law, bland titles like staff counsel did't help the briefer or the board. Some might suggest that the JA on the board should be able to do all the necessary explaining. This is a bit off the mark for two reasons. First, we can't always count on having a JA on the board. Second, in the case of the 05 board, there were over 800 cases fully briefed. The protocols for the briefing process do not really provide for the "on board JA" to chime in each time to augment the briefer's presentation. In many cases the on board JA will have some discussion w/the folks briefing JA cases during the work up

JA SPECIFIC RECOMENDATIONS

There is a limit to how much help the onboard JA can provide before obviously crossing the line from fellow board member to biased community advocate. If a board member crosses that line, they lose credibility w/ the group.

It was surprising how few JAs have documents in their OMPFs WRT their law school performance, law degrees, or bar certifications. For the most part, we are being promoted based on the board's assessment of future potential as professional legal advisors. Complete evidence of professional legal training and certifications should be in every JA's OMPF.

The joint shops should seek to have the RSs and ROs be folks that have written on Marines before. If they can't do that, the report is essentially a 1/1 and of diminished value. In that case, narrative comments comparing against other Marine officers observed can help, but the collective sense of the board was that the words in many reports were not in accord w/ the RV

JA SPECIFIC RECOMENDATIONS

For example: an RS will say MRO is one of our brightest stars, but the numbers show that the report is on a par w/ most of the other reports written by the RS. Observation of this phenomena on repeated occasions is what moves the boards attentions more and more to the numbers vice the words. Similarly, this dynamic reduces the value of reports in which Rel. Value comparisons are unavailable

With regard to duty station and job assignments, the O5 board clearly valued a breadth of legal experience over a single area of expertise. This was consistent w/ the board's view of a number of other support MOSs such as intelligence and logistics. Folks who were the duty expert in one area (geographically or subject matter) did not fair as well as folks who had succeeded in a variety of assignments and locations. That is not to say that every block in the JA field has to be checked by every JA who seeks promotion to 05. But the board was more comfortable w/ candidates who had, for example been a TC or DC, and civil law or legal assistance attorney, and

JA SPECIFIC RECOMENDATIONS

In this regard, note that DC/Quantico area is seen a single entity. Accordingly, back to back tours for captains/majors in Q-town and DC should be undertaken w/ caution in terms of career progression. Recommend that in most cases, if a captain or major is serving in DC/Q-town, their next tour should be back out at a base or station that houses operational forces. The board seemed to easily accept that the work done by lawyers on the base/station side of the house was of equal value of the work done on the FMF side at the same location (ie, Base CLNC vs. LSSS CLNC).

One final note WRT to out of MOS assignments for JA captains and majors. We have to fill our share of 9910 slots. However, in most cases JAs OMPFs don't receive much value added from these sorts of things as captains or majors. Time spent as an H&S BN XO or staff sec, or the like is time not spent in a challenging legal billet. That is not to say that those billets are bad, but rather that the timing and duration of them should be carefully considered. It would be best if JAs went to

HISTORICAL IZ PROMOTION DATA

FY 05

	O6	O5	O4
Overall:	50.4%	61.8%	85.2%
JA:	50% (4/8)	50% (10/20)	92.3% (12/13)
SEP:		48.4% (30/62)	

FY04

	O6	O5	O4
Overall:	51.2%	64.7%	87%
JA:	62.5% (5/8)	66.7% (12/18)	95.2% (20/21)
SEP:		48.7% (38/78)	

FY03

	O6	O5	O4
Overall:	56.3%	68.3%	88.7%
JA:	50.0% (6/12)	78.9% (15/19)	90.9 (20/22)
SEP:		61.8% (42/68)	

HISTORICAL IZ PROMOTION DATA

FY 02

	O6	O5	O4
Overall:	48.7%	65.7%	88%
JA:	50.0% (3/6)	72.2% (13/18)	80% (14/17)

FY01

	O6	O5	O4
Overall:	46.7%	64.3%	85%
JA:	55.6% (5/8)	66.7% (14/21)	70% (16/25)

FY00

	O6	O5	O4
Overall:	44.4%	67.7%	83.5%
JA:	100% (3/3)	61.9% (15/24)	93.1% (28/30)

HISTORICAL IZ PROMOTION DATA

FY99

	O6	O5	O4
Overall:	43.1%	66.7%	80.9%
JA:	40% (2/5)	56.3% (9/17)	76.2 (31/41)

FY98

	O6	O5	O4
Overall:	42.4%	68.2%	78.5%
JA:	60% (3/5)	78.9% (15/18)	74.2% (26/34)